

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION

DIEGO ALEXANDRO CAMPOS,)	
and ROBERTO CAMPOS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CAUSE NO. 3:11-CV-005 WL
v.)	
)	
STATE OF INDIANA,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

Roberto Campos, a *pro se* prisoner, filed a document captioned, “Motion for Reversal of August 5th decision 2010 Final Hearing Re: Name Change of Minor Son.” “A document filed *pro se* is to be liberally construed, and a *pro se* complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quotation marks and citations omitted). Nevertheless, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must review the merits of a prisoner complaint and dismiss it if the action is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6) provides for the dismissal of a complaint, or any portion of a complaint, for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Courts apply the same standard under § 1915A as when addressing a motion under RULE 12(b)(6). *Lagerstrom v. Kingston*, 463 F.3d 621, 624 (7th Cir. 2006).

Roberto Campos is asking this court to reverse a ruling by a state trial court in Dubois County which changed his son’s name without his consent. The authority of federal district courts to review state court judgments and related claims has been strictly limited by the *Rooker-Feldman*

doctrine. See *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923).

Under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, lower federal courts lack subject-matter jurisdiction when, after state proceedings have ended, a losing party in state court files suit in federal court complaining of an injury caused by the state-court judgment and seeking review and rejection of that judgment. In determining whether a federal plaintiff seeks review of a state-court judgment, we ask whether the injury alleged resulted from the state-court judgment itself. If it does, *Rooker-Feldman* bars the claim.

Beth-El All Nations Church v. City of Chicago, 486 F.3d 286, 292 (7th Cir. 2007) (citations omitted). Simply put, the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine “precludes lower federal court jurisdiction over claims seeking review of state court judgments or over claims ‘inextricably intertwined’ with state court judgments.” *Remer v. Burlington Area Sch. Dist.*, 205 F.3d 990, 996 (7th Cir. 2000).

The claim that Roberto Campos is attempting to adjudicate is beyond the jurisdiction of this court. Therefore this case must be dismissed.

For the foregoing reasons, this case is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: January 21, 2011

s/William C. Lee
William C. Lee, Judge
United States District Court